

-2-

REMARKS

The Examiner has stated in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance the following: "[t]he prior art of record does not provide for, nor suggests providing for a load balancing device which receives access requests from clients, applies a predetermined load balancing routine to determine which proxy device to route the request to, which then performs malware scanning, and then accesses a cache which stores only those files which have been determined not to be considered as malware. The proxy device determines predetermined attributes, such as user name, domain, password, an indication of the file to be accessed, a TCP/IP address of the client machine, amongst other items which can appropriately differentiate the access requests, and at the bare minimum require the indication of the file to be accessed, and the user name. These predetermined attributes will be reused by the proxy device during the processing of the access request, and therefore will be stored in a user cache of user attributes. The file cache only stores files which have already been determined not to be considered malware, which caches files which have already been scanned by the processing logic."

The Examiner has further stated that "[t]he claimed invention shows that the predetermined attributes are sent to the file storage device to enable the device to perform a validation check as claimed," that the prior art "is used on the authorization server, and not on the file storage servers," and that "[o]ne of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to have the authorization server as the claimed file server, since the authorization server controls the application gateway to allow access to the web server applications."

In response, applicant points out that the independent claims are not necessarily limited to each of the features that the Examiner has highlighted above. Specifically, just by way of example, applicant independently claims that "the processing logic is arranged to determine from the access request predetermined attributes," and not necessarily a "proxy device [that] determines predetermined attributes, such as user name, domain,

-3-

password, an indication of the file to be accessed, a TCP/IP address of the client machine, amongst other items which can appropriately differentiate the access requests, and at the bare minimum required the indication of the file to be accessed, and the user name," as indicated above.

In addition, applicant independently claims a technique "wherein the proxy device comprises a user cache utilized for storing the predetermined attributes," and not necessarily that the "predetermined attributes will be reused by the proxy device during the processing of the access request, and therefore will be stored in a user cache of user attributes," as indicated above.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. For payment of the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P476_01.124.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, P.C.

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 505-5100